

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,206	12/31/2001	Thierry Patureaux	Q65504	7563
7590 08/05/2004			EXAMINER	
Sughrue Mion Zinn			JOHNSON, JONATHAN J	
Macpeak& Sea	S		APTIBUT	BAREN AND ORDER
Suite 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW			1725	
Washington, D	C 20037-3213			
• •			DATE MAILED: 08/05/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				//_		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	("		
		09/890,206	PATUREAUX, THIERR	RY		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jonathan Johnson	1725			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicatio	n appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence addres	s		
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory price to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON.  FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report.  The areply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. (HS from the mailing date of this communication (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.		
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>24 June 2004</u> .				
2a) <u></u> ☐	·—	This action is non-final.				
3)□						
	closed in accordance with the practice un	der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the applica	ation.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 6-9 is/are	withdrawn from consideration.		,		
•	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.		7 3			
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[⊠	Claim(s) 1-13 are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.				
10)[	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected to b	y the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	o the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ne Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-1	52.		
Priority (	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docur  2. Certified copies of the priority docur	ments have been received.				
	3. ☑ Copies of the certified copies of the	·	•	ıe		
	application from the International Bu			, -		
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a		eceived.			
Attachmen	tic)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Su	ımmary (PTO-413)			
2)  Notic 3)  Infon	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S r No(s)/Mail Date	8) Paper No(s)	/Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)	)		
	1 1000-		4 ( )			

Application/Control Number: 09/890,206

Art Unit: 1725

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hundtofte (3,608,751). Hundtofte teaches a device for facilitate the filling of a vertical tube having at least 3 obstacles (Figure 1, item 4); that are at least in part of sett laterally in relation to the axis of the tube (Figure 1, item 4); where two of the obstacles are arranged in the tube at different levels (figure 1, item 4) and are symmetric in relation to the axis of the tube (Figure 1, item 4); and have rotational symmetry and that symmetry is offset in relation to cable (compare symmetry of Figure 1, top two items listed as item 2) where the obstacles have cylindrical shape (Figure 1, item 2). Although Hundtofte does not explicitly teach the dimension of the obstacles to be perpendicularly to the axis ranges between 0.25 and 0.75 times the diameter of the tube where the obstacles take up at least 80% of the lateral section of the tube, Hundtofte does teach ensuring that each particle is interrupted by a blade (col. 2, ll. 65-75). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the obstacles of Hundtofte to ensure the obstacles are perpendicular to the axis ranges between 0.25 and 0.75 times the diameter of the tube where the obstacles take up at least 80% of the lateral section of the tube in order to ensure the blade cushions each particle so that a low pressure drop Art Unit: 1725

is ensured (see Hundtofte col. 3, ll. 1-20). Put another way, Hundtofte teach size of the obstacle to be an art recognized result effective variable depending on the type of material to be used. That is, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to choose the instantly claimed ranges through process optimization, since it has been held that there the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. See In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4 and 6-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-1177. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on 571-272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/890,206

Art Unit: 1725

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jonathan Johnson

Examiner

Art Unit 1725